DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 567 TM 810 008

AUTHOR Adams, Ronald D.: Martray, Carl R.
TITLE Correlates of Teacher Perceived Problems.
PUB DATE 13 Nov 80
NOTE 58p.: Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (9th, New Orleans, LA, November 12-14, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures: Beginning Teachers: *Correlation: Data Collection: Elementary School Teachers: *Factor Structure: Higher Education: Longitudinal Studies: *Problems: Secondary School Teachers: Student Teachers: *Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Evaluation: Teacher Role: *Teaching (Occupation): *Teaching Experience: Test Interpretation
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky: Teacher Preparation Evaluation Inventory: Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program

ABSTRACT

Since 1972 Western Kentucky University has been evaluating graduates from the teacher education program via the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program. Participants were identified during student teaching and followed for five years with extensive data collected during the first, third and fifth years. Part of these data included a new scale, the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Inventory, designed specifically to assess teachers' perception of problems encountered in their professional role. A factor analyses of 17 items resulted in the identification of four factors: tasks related problems, teacher relationships, teaching special students, and discipline. These factors were correlated with four sets of other variables. Self report correlates were obtained from the F-scale, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Teacher Concerns Checklist. The Classroom Observation Record and Classroom Interaction Analysis provided correlates of teacher classroom behavior as collected from trained observers. Supervisor and peer ratings were the third set of variables examined for relationship to teacher perceived problems. Data from Student Evaluation of Teaching I and II obtained from the teachers' pupils were also correlated with the teacher's perceived problems. A final examination of teacher problems across years of teaching experience was made. Secondary and elementary teachers were analyzed separately. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195567

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CORRELATES OF TEACHER PERCEIVED PROBLEMS

Dr. Ronald D. Adams
Dr. Carl R. Martray

Western Kentucky University

Presented at the
9th Annual Conference of the
Mid-South Educational Research Association

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

New Orleans, Louisiana

November 13, 1980

TM 810008

Introduction

It is rare to have available for study data on teachers that are longitudinal and which are obtained from varied sources. The Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program (TPEP) at Western Kentucky University has been engaged in collecting data on students and graduates of their teacher education program since 1972. An important part of TPEP has been the systematic collection of data from the participants utilizing the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Inventory (TPEI). Included in this instrument were ratings of selected problem areas perceived by the student/graduate at various times in their professional career.

This study had dual purposes. The first purpose was to facilitate the interpretation of data and to provide more stable measures of teacher perceived problems by forming items into factors or constructs that had statistical and logical integrity. The second and major purpose of the study was to identify probable correlates of teacher perceived problems across four experience levels. It should be emphasized that this study was more exploratory than definitive in nature.

Outcomes of these analyses offer a unique view of early teacher development as they leave the preparatory program, enter the teaching profession and gain experience as a teacher. The individual follow-up studies were limited to relatively small n-sizes due to sampling limitations, attrition from the teaching profession, and missing data resulting from instrument revision. However, it was the investigators' decision to analyze data across experience levels, separately for elementary and secondary teachers, rather than to combine all available data. The results appear to justify this decision.

Although research to date is rather limited in regard to longitudinal studies of factors that have been identified as critically perceived problems of teachers, some attempts that are cross-sectional in nature have been made to identify specific factors. Perhaps the most well known researchers in this

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

area are the Ohio State University group working with Donald Cruickshank and his Teacher Problem Check List (TPCL). Of particular interest here is a factor analytic study conducted by Cruickshank, Kennedy, and Myers (1975) which was designed to investigate the perceived problems of teachers only. Factors that emerged in this study were interpreted and labeled as follows:

Factor I: Efficiency - Wanting to have skills and to accomplish tasks considered essential to learning.

Factor II: Support - Wanting the understanding and sustenance of administrators and other teachers so that I can be efficient and feel professional.

Factor III: Invigoration - Wanting to vitalize my students' interests in learning and improve their achievement.

Factor IV: Control - Wanting to get students to behave as I want them to behave.

Factor V: Inclusion - Wanting to establish and maintain rapport with students, other teachers, and administrators. Being interested in them and having them interested in me.

Factor VI: Nurturance - Wanting to help students who have problems.

Factor VII: Influencing - Wanting to change the perceptions and attitudes of students and their parents toward themselves and education.

These findings led the researchers to two basic conclusions. The first was that teacher problems consisted of role-related strivings which the teacher either never encountered or was unprepared. The second conclusion was that teacher problems were not unlike problem areas identified by people in general, but may be interpreted differently because of internalized human "teacher" needs making goals more difficult to attain.

In a study reported by Adams and Sandefur (1976) focusing upon the perceived problems of first year teachers, problems perceived as most serious fell into four basic areas: (1) classroom discipline, (2) motivation of students, (3) relevance of materials used in the classroom, and (4) self-evaluation of teaching success. This study provided the initial basis for the present factor analytic study of teacher perceived problems.

The recent interest manifested in the general area of teacher stress has resulted in a number of studies aimed at identifying problems of teachers which contribute to the stress index. In a study of first year teachers conducted by Gaede (1978) specific problems centered around establishing a favorable reputation among students, teachers, and administrators; organizing and preparing for new instructional assignments; and adapting to an entirely new professional role. Landsmann (1978) reported that teachers felt that tension and pressure was heightened as a result of the problems associated with large class size, lack of teaching materials, discipline problems, hectic schedules permitting few breaks, and increased public pressures on teachers. In addition, the factor of support on the part of the administration was perceived as a major source of stress if this support were not present. Most other studies located related to the concept of teacher stress identified problems similar to these studies with the perceived problem of discipline being most prevalent.

Procedures

Data utilized in this study were collected as part of the TPEP begun in 1972 and continued through 1980. Each year a new sample of student teachers was selected and follow-up data were collected on teachers who remained in teaching in Kentucky for five years. Sampling procedures included random selection of student teachers for the first five cycles (years) after which

sampling was selective, primarily based on subject majors of the student teachers. Table 1 contains the number of participants at the various phases of data collection.

TABLE 1

Number of Teachers Who Remained in the Study Sample Over a Seven-Year Period

Cycle	Level	Phase 1 Student Teaching	Phase 2 1st Year Teaching	Phase 3 3rd Year Teaching	Phase 4 5th Year Teaching
Cycle I (1972)	Elementary	20	15	10	6
	Secondary	18	7	3	3
Cycle II (1973)	Elementary	20	13	7	6
	Secondary	20	8	5	4
Cycle III (1974)	Elementary	19	16	14	11
	Secondary	17	9	8	7
Cycle IV (1975)	Elementary	18	14	9	8
	Secondary	20	6	6	7
Cycle V (1976)	Elementary	20	12	8	No data for Cycle V Cycle VI Cycle VII Cycle VIII
	Secondary	20	5	6	
Cycle VI (1977)	Elementary	36	22	17	
	Secondary	35	10	10	
Cycle VII (1978)	Elementary	33	18	No data for Cycle VII Cycle VIII	
	Secondary	18	10		
Cycle VIII (1979)	Elementary	61	17		
	Secondary	72	10		
Total	Elementary	227	127	65	31
	Secondary	220	65	38	21

The data collected from student and inservice teachers included direct classroom observation by trained observers, pupil, peer, and supervisor ratings, standardized tests of personal characteristics (self report data) and various demographic information. The Teacher Preparation Evaluation Inventory (TPEI) was developed as part of a battery of instruments given to participants during each level of experience. The TPEI was developed by personnel at Western Kentucky University's Office of Educational Research and CEMREL, Inc. located in St. Louis, Missouri to assess students' and graduates' perceptions of their teacher education programs and perceptions of selected problem areas in teaching. Two forms of the TPEI have been used in TPEP. The Form A included items about specific courses taken and was completed by student teachers. Form B excluded the items on specific courses and was completed by inservice teachers. Appendix A contains Form A of the TPEI.

There were revisions in the TPEI during the early years resulting in some data gaps. The items in this study reflect a data collection effort that allowed for the optimum in n-size and item variety. The items used for this study are as follows:

1. Developing rapport with students
2. Teaching physically handicapped students
3. Teaching disrespectful students
4. Teaching students of different socio-economic levels
5. Maintaining discipline
6. Relevance of material from student's point of view
7. Teaching students of different ability levels in the same classroom
8. Relationships with students
9. Faculty relationships
10. Relationship with administrators
11. Relationship with parents

12. Test preparation and use for evaluation of student performance
13. Use of alternative teaching techniques
14. Motivating students
15. Use of classroom materials including audio-visual aids
16. Self-evaluation of teaching
17. Knowledge of outside resources to enhance the teaching/learning process

Data were collected during student teaching and near the end of the first, third, and fifth years of teaching experience. Two visits were made to each participant during each data collection year. The forms were explained at the initial visit and the completed instruments collected at the second visit approximately one week later. Each year data were transferred from the instruments to computer tape for analyses and storage. While a record of teacher data has been maintained across eight samples of teachers over a nine year period, earlier data were not utilized in this study due to item revision of the TPEI in 1976. Thus, only the data collected during the last four years were selected for analyses.

Data Analyses

Two major analyses of data were conducted to meet the objectives of this study. The first analyses were to obtain easily interpretable and stable measures of the teacher problem data. The second analyses provided correlation matrices of the teacher problem variables with selected other measures to determine correlates of the teacher problem perception factor scores for the four experience levels. All analyses were conducted separately for elementary and secondary participants.

Factor Analysis

Factor analyses of the data obtained from the TPEI were computed to assist in interpretation of teacher perceived problems and to provide a more stable measure of these constructs. These statistical analyses were made via the

Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, et. al., 1975) using the VARIMAX subprogram. This technique allowed for the determination of factor solutions that maximizes the "independence" of the factors. Criteria for item selection as representative of the individual factors was based on the magnitude of item loadings and the logic of the content of the item. In addition, each factor selected had eigen values of one or greater.

The factor analyses were conducted with 222 cases using data from across experience levels of teachers and using both elementary and secondary prepared teachers. The results of these analyses appear in Table 2. Four factors emerged from the varimax rotation analyses; factor one having six items, factor two having four items, and factors three and four having two items each. Based on the content of the items, these factors were labeled as follows:

Factor one - Teaching Tasks

Factor two - Human Relations

Factor three - Teaching Differing Students

Factor four - Discipline

These four factors were computed for each TPEP participant and were used as the measures for teacher perceived problems for the remainder of the analyses. Means and standard deviations of the factor scores by experience level and preparation level appear in Table 3. The values assigned to the rating scales provided scores such that the higher the value the less the factor was perceived as a problem. It appears that "Discipline" and "Teaching Differing Students" were perceived as the most severe problems while "Teaching Tasks" and "Human Relations" were perceived as less severe.

TABLE 2

Factor Analyses of Teacher Perceived Problems
Obtained From The Teacher Preparation
Evaluation Inventory (TPEI)

	ITEM	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1.	Developing rapport with students	.280	.403	.326	.405
2.	Teaching physically handicapped students	.192	.095	.032	.174
3.	Teaching disrespectful students	.064	.093	.179	.731*
4.	Teaching different SES students	.254	.075	.566*	.225
5.	Maintaining discipline	.271	.256	.131	.653*
6.	Relevance of material for students	.473	.175	.329	.258
7.	Teaching different ability students	.251	.118	.707*	.090
8.	Relationships with students	.388	.589*	.256	.227
9.	Faculty relationships	.225	.783*	.077	.069
10.	Relationships with administrators	.153	.748*	.037	.159
11.	Relationships with parents	.317	.612*	.179	.240
12.	Test preparation and use	.586*	.241	.175	.292
13.	Use of alternative teaching techniques	.620*	.239	.318	.155
14.	Motivating students	.509*	.192	.434	.226
15.	Use of classroom materials	.560*	.172	.186	.119
16.	Self evaluation of teaching	.573*	.288	.169	.075
17.	Knowledge of outside resources	.719*	.183	.187	.077

* Those items selected for factor representation

TABLE 3

Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Problem Factor Scores Across Experience Levels

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	S
Factor 1 Teaching Tasks						
Student Teachers	3.167	.607	3.188	.560	3.176	.587
1st Year Teachers	3.261	.387	3.308	.382	3.276	.384
3rd Year Teachers	3.043	.488	3.106	.503	3.069	.492
5th Year Teachers	2.950	.561	3.012	.384	2.970	.508
Total	3.127	.517	3.170	.493	3.143	.508
Factor 2 Human Relations						
Student Teachers	3.399	.783	3.538	.582	3.463	.697
1st Year Teachers	3.616	.432	3.580	.420	3.605	.426
3rd Year Teachers	3.466	.520	3.477	.461	3.470	.495
5th Year Teachers	3.414	.534	3.353	.668	3.393	.577
Total	3.487	.579	3.504	.527	3.494	.559
Factor 3 Teaching Differing Students						
Student Teachers	2.980	.735	2.936	.780	2.961	.751
1st Year Teachers	2.825	.663	2.982	.585	2.875	.640
3rd Year Teachers	2.814	.663	2.871	.632	2.835	.648
5th Year Teachers	2.609	.693	3.031	.531	2.750	.668
Total	2.826	.692	2.943	.658	2.870	.681
Factor 4 Discipline						
Student Teachers	2.701	.743	2.683	.658	2.692	.702
1st Year Teachers	2.838	.672	2.779	.675	2.818	.671
3rd Year Teachers	2.836	.543	2.792	.614	2.805	.629
5th Year Teachers	2.903	.611	2.656	.569	2.891	.603
Total	2.787	.690	2.722	.646	2.760	.673

* Range of factor scores was 1 to 4 with 1 being severe problems and 4 no problems.

Correlates of Teacher Perceived Problems

Each of the four teacher perceived problem factors were correlated with variable sets available as part of the total TPEP data set. The Pearson product-moment correlation technique was employed to assess the individual relationships. The sets of data analyzed for this study were:

1. Demographic Variables
2. Self Report Variables
3. Classroom Observations by Trained Observers
4. Student Evaluations
5. Supervisor Ratings
6. Peer Ratings

Correlation coefficients were computed separately for elementary and secondary prepared teachers by experience levels.

The criteria used to determine if an individual variable was a correlate of a teacher perceived problem factor were magnitude of the correlation, $r \geq .300$, and significantly different from zero at the .05 confidence level. The n-sizes ranged from 11 to 59 resulting in some correlation coefficients being spuriously high for samples with lower n-sizes. Coefficients computed on samples of 15 or less are identified with an "*". Only correlations that met the .300 and significance level criteria were reported.

The findings of this section of the study were organized into four tables reporting the correlation coefficients for each perceived problem factor by experience level and level of preparation.

The variable set, data source, description of the variable, and correlation coefficient (r) were reported to facilitate analyses of the findings. Tables 4 through 7 contain these findings.

TABLE 4

Correlates of the Teaching Tasks Factor

STUDENT TEACHERS

	Elementary			Secondary		
Variable Set	Source	Description of Item	r	Source	Description of Item	r
Demographic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self Report	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.300	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.341
				TPEI	Perception of Subject Matter Prep.	.409
Classroom Observation	COR	Factor B Empathy/ Rapport	.312	0	0	0
	IA	Student Talk to Teacher Talk Ratio	-.308			
	IA	% Student Talk	-.391			
Student Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supervisor Rating	TEP/S 1	Classroom Teaching Competence	-.300	TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	.426
	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Information	.347	TEP/S 2	Democratic Classroom	-.314

1ST YEAR TEACHERS

	Elementary			Secondary		
Variable Set	Source	Description of Item	r	Source	Description of Item	r
Demographic	0	0	0	GPA	Total	-.434
				GPA	Subject Major	-.322
Self Report	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Observation	IA	Student Ques. to Student Resp. Ratio	-.300	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supervisor Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 2	Grasp of Subject	.462
				TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Techniques	.550
				TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Interactive style	.448
				TEP/S 2	Provides for Indiv. Differences	.569
				TEP/S 2	Clear Obj./Procedures/Rules	.501
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & Cheerful Toward Students	.699
				TEP/S 2	Concerned with Feelings of Students	.643
				TEP/S 2	Values The Affective Climate	.495

TABLE 4 - Continued

3RD YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	GPA	Professional Ed.	.373	GPA	Total	-.330
				GPA	Professional Ed.	-.332
Self Report	TCC	Self Concern (Adult)	-.311	0	0	0
	TCC	Task Concern (Instruction)	-.323			
	TCC	Task Concern (Discipline)	-.408			
	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.457			
	TPEI	Perception of Subject Matter Prep	.364			
	TPEI	Perception of Teacher Ed. Prog	.318			
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Lively & Interesting	.464	SET 1	Lively & Interesting	.323
	SET 2	Stimulating/Inter-active Style	.348	SET 1	Indirect Classroom Procedure	.304
	SET 2	Interactive Competence	.353	SET 2	Interactive Competence	.304
	SET 2	Fostering Student Self-Esteem	.467	SET 2	Unreasonable Negativity	.326
Supervisor Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 1	Relations with Students	.349
				TEP/S 2	Grasp of Sub.	.368
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 2	Meaningful & Relevant Examples	.380
				TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Information	.447

5TH YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	GPA	Total	-.710*
				GPA	Subject Major	-.615*
				TPEI	# of School Respon.	-.565*
Self Report	0	0	0	TCC	Self Concern (Adult)	-.603*
				RoKeach	Dogmatism Scale	-.446*
				F-Scale		-.508*
Classroom Observation	IA	% Lecture	.313	IA	Big I/D Ratio	.644*
				IA	% Lecture	-.458*
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Discipline	.561*	SET 1	Knowledgable & Poised	-.468*
				SET 1	Indirect Classroom Procedure	.500*
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	-.344	TEP/S 1	Relations with Stud.	.550*
	TEP/S 2	Democratic Classroom	.378	TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Inter-active Style	.574*
				TEP/S 2	Discipline Without Being Harsh	.620*
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Indicates n - size $\leq$ 15

TABLE 5

Correlates of the Human Relations Factor

STUDENT TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self Report	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Observation	COR	Factor B Empathy/ Rapport	.417	IA	% Direct Teacher Behavior	-.386
	COR	Factor C Pupil Behavior	.310			
	COR	Factor D Surgent/ Stimulating Style	.417			
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Lively & Interesting	.477*	SET 1	Lively & Interesting	.370
				SET $\bar{X}$	Mean (1-5)	.402
Supervisor Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

1ST YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	TPEI	# of Siblings	-.372
				TPEI	Perception of Health	.323
Self Report	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Observation	IA	Student Ques. to Stud. Resp. Ratio	.300	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 1	Subject Matter Competence	.331	TEP/S 1	Subject Matter Competence	.634
				TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	.643
				TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Inter-Active Style	.555
				TEP/S 2	Provides for Indiv. Diff.	.523
				TEP/S 2	Warm/Supportive Classroom Climate	.429
				TEP/S 2	Clear Obj./Proced./ Rules	.664
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & Cheerful Toward Students	.659
				TEP/S 2	Concerned With Feelings of Students	.774
				TEP/S 2	Values the Affec-tive Climate	.454
				TEP/S 2	Fair Toward Student	.443
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 1	Expectations of Students	-.390
				TEP/S 1	Grasp of Subject	-.359

TABLE 5 - Continued

3RD YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	TPEI	Age of Participant	.320
				TPEI	# of Siblings	-.450*
Self Report	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.314	TCC	Self Concern (Adult)	.377
				TCC	Self Concern (Pupil)	.492
				TCC	Impact Concern (Academic)	.352
				TPEI	Perception of Subject Matter Prep.	.327
Classroom Observation	IA	% Lecture	-.358	COR	Factor A Organizat./ Management	.358
Student Evaluation	0	0	0	SET 1	Lively & Interesting	.312
				SET 2	Interactive Combat.	-.384
				SET 2	Stimulating/Interactive Style	-.377
				SET 2	Rapport	-.336
				SET 2	Unreasonable Negat.	.351
				SET 2	Fostering Student Self Esteem	-.319
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Democratic Class.	.517	TEP/S 2	Enthusiasm for Subj.	.370
	TEP/S 2	Grasp of Subject	.381	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Info.	.506
	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Info.	.472	TEP/S 2	Provides for Indiv. Diff.	.372
	TEP/S 2	Enthusiasm for Subj.	.331			
	TEP/S 2	Clear Obj./Proced./ Rules	.300			

5TH YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self Report	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	COR	Factor A Organizat./ Management	.417
				COR	Factor B Empathy/ Rapport	.687
				COR	Factor C Pupil Behavior	.434
				IA	Big I/D Ratio	.472
				IA	% Indirect Teacher Behavior	.557
				IA	% Direct Teacher Behavior	-.694
				IA	Student Ques. to Stud. Resp. Ratio	-.494
				IA	% Student Talk	-.645
Student Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	-.344	TEP/S 2	Not Formal and Aloof	.645*

TABLE 6

Correlates of the Teaching Differing Students Factor

STUDENT TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self Report	0	0	0	TPEI	Perception of Subj. Matter Prep.	.414
				TPEI	Perception of Teach. Ed. Prog.	.370
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	COR	Factor A Organ./ Management	.302
				IA	% Silence	.312
				IA	% Lecture	-.303
				IA	% Indirect Teacher Behavior	.300
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Indirect Class. Proc.	-.459	0	0	0
	SET 2	Rapport	.327			
	SET 2	Interaction Compet.	.441			
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 1	Expectations of Stud.	-.340	TEP/S 2	Grasp of Subject	.403
	TEP/S 1	Class. Teaching Comp.	-.321	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Info.	.314
	TEP/S 2	Meaningful & Relevant Excmples	-.356	TEP/S 2	Variety of Teach. Tech.	.340
				TEP/S 2	Values the Affective Climate	.325
				TEP/S 2	Fair Toward Student	.404

1ST YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	GPA	Total	-.329
				GPA	Subject Major	-.383
Self Report	0	0	0	TPEI	Perception of Subj. Matter Prep.	-.465
Classroom Observation	IA	Little I/d ratio	-.300	IA	Big I/D Ratio	.360
				IA	Student Talk to Teacher Talk Ratio	.359
				IA	% Student Talk	.395
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Indirect Classroom Procedure	-.606*	SET 1	Friendly & Cheerful	+.347
				SET 2	Rapport	+.335
					Unreasonable Negat.	+.362
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Not formal & Aloof	.301	TEP/S 2	Concerned w/feelings of Students	.455
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 6 - Continued

3RD YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	TPEI	# of Siblings	.444	TPEI	Age of Participant	.344
	GPA	Prof. Education	.306	GPA	Prof. Education	-.336
	TPEI	Percep. of Health	.300	TPEI	# of School Respon.	-.456
Self Report	TCC	Task Concern (Instruction)	-.302	TCC	Task Concern (Inst.)	-.314
	TCC	Task Concern (Discipline)	-.324	TCC	Task Concern (Disc.)	-.432
	TCC	Impact Concern (Academic,	-.306			
	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.419			
	TPEI	Perception of Subj. Matter Prep.	.386			
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	IA	Big I/D ratio	.437
				IA	% Lecture	-.308
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Indirect Class. Proc.	.560	SET 1	Indirect Class. Proc.	.397
	SET $\bar{X}$	Mean (1-5)	.463	SET 2	Stimulating/Inter-active Style	.340
	SET 2	Interactive Comp.	.384	SET 2	Rapport	.345
				SET 2	Unreasonable Negat.	.376
				SET 2	Fostering Student Self Esteem	.508
Supervisor Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 1	Expectations of Students	-.417
				TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	-.328
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

5TH YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	TPEI	# of School Respon.	-.378	TPEI	# of Students in Class Observed	-.435*
Self Report	RoKeach	Dogmatism Scale	-.317	RoKeach	Dogmatism Scale	-.430
Classroom Observ.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Indirect Class. Proc.	.533*	SET 1	Knowledgeable & Poised	-.411
				SET 1	Discipline	.422
				SET 1	Indirect Class. Proc.	.603
				SET $\bar{X}$	Mean (1-5)	.477
				SET 2	Stimulating/Inter-active Style	.552
				SET 2	Interactive Comp.	.706
				SET 2	Fostering Student Self Esteem	.471
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Info.	-.323	TEP/S 2	Provides for Indiv. Diff.	.448*
				TEP/S 2	Not Formal & Aloof	.573*
				TEP/S 2	Discipline Without Being Harsh	-.498*
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & Cheerful Toward Students	-.451*
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 7

Correlates of the Discipline Factor

STUDENT TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self Report	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Observ.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	SET 2	Rapport	.373	0	0	0
	SET 2	Interactive Comp.	.487			
Supervisor Rating	TEP/S 2	Friendly & cheerful toward students	.490	TEP/S 2	Keeps abreast of new info.	.335
				TEP/S 2	Enthus. for Subject	.463
				TEP/S 2	Variety of Teaching Tech.	.342
				TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Interactive Style	.301
				TEP/S 2	Provides for indiv. diff.	.496
				TEP/S 2	Warm/supportive classroom climate	.318
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & cheerful toward students	.430
				TEP/S 2	Values the affective climate	.305
				TEP/S 2	Fair toward students	.406
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	0	0	0

1ST YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Elementary Description of Item	Elementary r	Secondary Source	Secondary Description of Item	Secondary r
Demographic	0	0	0	TPEI	# of Classes taught	-.421
Self Report	TCC	Task Concern (Disc.)	-.328	TCC	Self Concern (Adult)	.519
				TPEI	Perception of Teach. Ed. Prog.	.302
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	COR	Factor A Organ./ Management	.467
				COR	Factor B Empathy/ Rapport	.336
				COR	Factor C Pupil Behavior	.441
				COR	Factor D Surgent/ Stimulating Style	.370
				IA	% Lecture	.318
Student Evaluation	SET 1	Discipline	.314	SET 2	Stim/Interact. Style	.339
				SET 2	Interactive Comp.	.458
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Clear Obj/Proc/rules	.300	TEP/S 1	Relations w/students	.370
	TEP/S 1	Relations w/students	.407	TEP/S 2	Keeps abreast of new info.	.494
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & cheerful	.445
				TEP/S 2	Concerned w/feelings of students	.411
Peer Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 1	Relations w/students	.432
				TEP/S 1	Expect. of students	.337
				TEP/S 2	Not formal & aloof	.639

TABLE 7 - Continued

3RD YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Description of Item	r	Secondary Source	Description of Item	r
Demographic	0	0	0	TPEI	Age of Participant	.304
				GPA	Total	-.376
				GPA	Professional Ed.	-.443
Self Report	TCC	Self Concern (Pupil)	-.336	TCC	Task Concern (Discipline)	-.437
	TCC	Task Concern (Inst.)	-.314			
	TCC	Task Concern (Discipline)	-.483			
	TPEI	Perception of Prof. Ed. Courses	.302			
	TPEI	Perception of Sub. Matter Prep	.308			
Classroom Observation	IA	% Lecture	-.329	0	0	0
Student Evaluation	SET $\bar{X}$	Mean (1-5)	.339	SET 1	Knowledgeable & Poised	-.351
	SET 2	Rapport	.300			
	SET 2	Interactive Comp.	.349			
	SET 2	Unreasonable Neg.	-.458			
Supervisor Ratings	0	0	0	TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Interactive Style	.352
				TEP/S 1	Fair Toward Studts	.394
Peer Ratings	TEP/S 1	Relations w/students	.456	TEP/S	Democratic Classroom	.328
	TEP/S 2	Grasp of Subject	.300			

5TH YEAR TEACHERS

Variable Set	Elementary Source	Description of Item	r	Secondary Source	Description of Item	r
Demographic	0	0	0	GPA	Total	-.460
				GPA	Subject Major	-.600*
Self Report	TCC	Self Concern (Adult)	-.455		0	0
	TCC	Self Concern (Pupil)	-.342			
	RoKeach	Dogmatism Scale	-.312			
Classroom Observation	0	0	0	COR	Factor B Empathy/ Rapport	.507
				COR	Factor C Pupil Behavior	.534
				IA	Big I/D Ratio	.558
				IA	% Silence	-.455
Student Evaluation	SET 2	Rapport	.330	SET 1	Friendly & Cheerful	.481
	SET 2	Unreasonable Negativity	.367	SET 1	Lively/Interesting	.417
				SET 1	Indirect Classroom Procedure	.461
				SET 2	Stimulating/Interactive Style	.457
				SET 2	Rapport	.526
Supervisor Ratings	TEP/S 2	Keeps Abreast of New Information	-.378	TEP/S 2	Stimulating/Interactive Style	.515*
				TEP/S 2	Provides for Indiv. Differences	.474*
				TEP/S 2	Friendly & Cheerful Toward Students	-.444*

The authors felt that a lengthy discussion of the instrumentation used to obtain data for the correlates would not enhance this paper. However, a variable list is provided in Appendix B, along with a brief description of the data source. Further more detailed descriptions of instrumentation are available in the publications presented in the "Reference" section of this paper.

Findings for each of the four factors are discussed, however, the reader is invited to study the tables and draw your own conclusions from the data presented.

Discussion of the Teaching Tasks Factor

The variable set labeled as "Demographic" produced only one finding of importance across experience levels of the teachers studied. For secondary teachers during their first, third, and fifth years of teaching, there appeared to be a consistant negative correlation with lack of teacher perceived teaching task problems and grade point averages. Teachers who had higher undergraduate GPA's reported more problems with teaching tasks. Elementary teacher data only produced one correlation for third year teachers. A positive correlation for professional education GPA was obtained indicating a reversal from secondary teacher data. Speculation as to the reasons for the negative correlations is that secondary teachers may be more subject oriented and set high expectations for their students. Also, secondary teachers have less professional education courses than do elementary teachers. These findings offer an important area for further study as GPA is a major consideration in teacher placement.

Self report analyses yielded some interesting results. Student teacher and third year teacher data indicated that perceptions of their preparation programs were related positively to their perceptions of lack of teaching tasks problems. While these findings were not consistant across all experience

groups, there was an indication that teachers who perceived their undergraduate course work as beneficial also perceived fewer problems with teaching tasks.

Third year elementary teacher data produced negative correlations between lack of teaching tasks problems and concerns about teaching. This finding was expected since the higher the self and task concerns teachers express can logically be associated to their higher perception of problems with teaching tasks. It is somewhat surprising that a more consistant pattern of correlations were not observed for these variables.

Secondary fifth year teacher data indicated that negative relationships existed between lack of teacher task problems and measures of dogmatism and authoritarianism. Teachers who were scored as high in these measures perceived more problems with teaching tasks.

Classroom observation data did not produce a consistant pattern of correlations with the teaching tasks factor. From the correlations that were reported, teachers who were observed as more student oriented, encouraged student participation, and less inclined to lecture reported fewer problems with teaching tasks.

An interesting finding emerged regarding student evaluations of the teachers. No correlations were observed for student teachers and first year teachers. However, student evaluations were correlated with lack of teaching task problems for third and fifth year teachers. In general, teachers who received high student ratings in stimulating and interactive style and in indirect or student oriented classroom procedure reported fewer problems with teaching tasks. It appears that student ratings were appropriate predictors of teaching tasks problems for experienced teachers but not for student or beginning teachers.

Supervisor ratings were one of the most consistant of the variable sets in predicting secondary teachers perception of teaching tasks problems, but much less so for elementary teachers. For student teacher data, cooperating teacher

ratings produced inconsistant results for both elementary and secondary student teachers. However, for secondary first, third, and fifth year teachers, supervisor ratings were consistently correlated with teaching tasks problems data. These correlations suggested that supervisors (generally principals) rated those teachers high who had fewer perceived problems. While this finding may not be surprising, they do indicate that secondary supervisors are able to differentiate between teachers who are having problems and those who are not; a point of some controversy among many teachers and school administrators. The lack of correlation between these variables for elementary teacher data may suggest the opposite findings for elementary teacher supervisors.

Peer ratings failed to produce a consistent pattern of correlation coefficients. Only third year secondary teacher data yielded peer rating correlations with teaching tasks problems. These were primarily ratings of subject matter competence, but were positively correlated with lack of teacher problems.

Discussion of the Human Relations Factor

The variable sets of demographics and self report failed to produce any significant coefficients in regard to the human relations factor for the student teacher sample. The classroom observation set, however, did produce significant correlations indicating that elementary student teachers who demonstrated high degrees of empathy, rapport, control, and stimulating styles did not perceive human relations as a major problem. In the secondary student teacher sample, the variable concerned with percentage of direct teacher behavior indicated that those student teachers who demonstrated a high percentage of direct teacher behavior perceived the human relations factor as a major problem. The student evaluation of teacher variable set produced similar coefficients for both the elementary and secondary student teacher samples. These data indicated that

those teachers who were evaluated as lively and interesting by their students had few problems with human relations type variables. Supervisor ratings failed to produce significant coefficients with both samples.

The first year teacher data produced quite differing patterns than the student teacher data on the human relations factor. The demographic and self report data failed to produce significant coefficients except for two demographic variables for the secondary teacher sample. Number of siblings correlated negatively and thus indicated that the greater the sibling number, the more the human relations factor was viewed as a problem. In addition, the perception of health variable indicated that teachers possessing better perceptions of one's own health did not perceive variables related to the human relations factor as much of a problem. The classroom observation and student evaluation variable sets did not produce significant coefficients as they did with the student teacher data. The supervisor ratings variable set however produced many significant coefficients for the secondary teacher sample. The data indicated that those first year teachers who were rated high by their supervisors in subject matter competence, using differing teaching techniques, stimulating, warm, friendly, cheerful, concerned with student feelings, and providing for individual differences did not view variables making up the human relations factor as much of a problem in their teaching. In addition, those secondary teachers as rated by their peers as having unrealistic expectations of students and a poor grasp of subject matter perceived the human relations factor as a major problem. Peer ratings failed to produce significant data for the first year elementary teaching sample.

Data produced by the third year teacher sample was similar to the first year teacher sample in regard to demographics, however the self report variable set produced significant coefficients which was quite different from the first

year group. The data indicated that secondary teachers who reported high concerns about self in regard to adults and pupils as well as academic impact concerns perceived human relations as a major problem. Classroom observation data indicated that elementary teachers who utilize a high percentage of lecture in the classroom perceived human relations as a major problem. The secondary teacher data on this variable set indicated that those teachers who demonstrated good organization and management skills saw human relations as not a major problem. Although the student evaluation data failed to produce significant coefficients with the elementary sample, this variable set was quite productive with the secondary sample. The data indicated that teachers evaluated by students as lively and interesting, having good interactive skills, stimulating, possessing good rapport, and effective in fostering student self-esteem did not perceive human relations as a major problem. The student evaluation data also indicated that teachers who were rated by students as unreasonably negative perceived the human relations factor high in regard to problems. Supervisor and peer ratings of third year teachers for both the elementary and secondary samples indicated that teachers viewed as having a good grasp of subject matter, enthusiastic, provide for individual differences of students, and who keep abreast of new information in their teaching area rated human relations problems as generally insignificant.

In reference to the fifth year teacher sample, demographic and self report data failed to produce any significant coefficients. Classroom observation data also failed to produce any significant findings with the elementary sample, but produced a plethora of significant coefficients with the secondary teacher sample. The data indicated that those fifth year teachers with good organization and management skills, empathy and rapport, and pupil control viewed the human

relations factor as less of a problem than their counterparts. In addition, those teachers who engaged in more indirect behaviors viewed human relations problems as minimal, while those who engage in more direct behaviors saw human relations as a major problem. Student evaluation of fifth year teachers, both elementary and secondary, failed to produce the significant findings which were present in the third year teacher sample. Finally, supervisor ratings produced coefficients indicating that elementary teachers who use a variety of teaching techniques and secondary teachers who are rather formal in their interaction with students perceived the human relations factor as a problem.

Discussion of the Teaching Differing Students Factor

Correlates of the Teaching of Differing Students factor were quite different for elementary and secondary student teachers. Elementary student teacher data produced no correlates for demographic, self report or classroom observation data. Student evaluations produced somewhat contradictory findings in that a negative correlation was observed for indirect or student oriented classroom procedure and lack of problems in teaching differing students while a positive correlation was observed for teacher rapport and interaction competence with lack of teaching differing students problems. These findings suggest that teachers whose students perceive the classroom as highly indirect (allowing students to share in decision making) perceive more problems in teaching differing students. However, teachers whose students perceive them as having rapport with students and competent in interaction with students perceive fewer problems with teaching differing students.

A disturbing finding was noted for supervisor ratings. Data from supervising teachers of elementary student teachers produced negative correlations with lack of problems in teaching differing students. This findings suggested

that student teachers who reported having more severe problems with teaching differing students received higher supervisor ratings.

Secondary student teacher data produced no correlations for demographic data or student evaluation data. However, secondary student teachers who perceived subject matter preparation and/or their teacher education program as more beneficial, also reported less problems in teaching differing students.

The classroom observation data produced consistent correlations with teaching differing students problems. Student teachers who were observed as organized, student oriented (indirect teacher behavior), and provided for constructive silence in the classroom reported fewer problems. Teachers who lectured more reported more problems with teaching differing students.

Quite unlike elementary student teacher supervisors, secondary supervising teachers' ratings were positively correlated with lack of problems in teaching differing students.

First year teacher data also differed for elementary and secondary prepared teachers. Only three correlates were found for elementary first year teachers. Indirect first year teachers, both as observed by trained observers and as evaluated by students, and teachers who were rated by supervisors as more aloof or formal reported more problems with teaching differing students.

Secondary first year teacher data produced correlates with GPA similar to the teaching task variables. Teachers with higher total GPA and subject matter GPA tended to report more problems with teaching differing students. Also, first year teachers who rated their preparation in subject matter higher had more problems with teaching differing students.

Observation data provided correlates that indicated first year secondary teachers who were more indirect (student oriented) and who solicited more student talk in the classroom had fewer problems with teaching differing students.

Similarly, teachers who received more favorable student ratings of being friendly, having rapport with students and non negative classroom climate also reported fewer problems with teaching differing students.

Only one supervisor rating, concern for student feelings, was correlated positively with lack of problems in teaching differing students.

Third year teacher data produced more correlates with teaching differing students for elementary first year teachers. Number of siblings, professional education GPA, and perception of health were positively correlated with lack of problems in teaching differing students for elementary first year teachers. A reversal was noted for secondary third year teachers for the professional education GPA variable. A negative correlation was found for these variables indicating that secondary third year teachers who had high GPA's in their professional education courses tended to report more problems with teaching differing students. Also, younger teachers and teachers with more school responsibilities tended to report more problems in this area.

Self report data produced correlates for elementary and secondary third year teachers. Elementary and secondary teachers with high teaching task concerns tended to report more problems in teaching differing students than teachers with lower task concerns. Elementary teachers who perceived their professional education and subject matter preparation as beneficial reported fewer problems in teaching differing students.

Third year secondary teacher data produced correlates that followed the established pattern for observational data. Indirect teachers and teachers who lecture less reported fewer problems with teaching differing students.

Student evaluations of teachers were positively correlated with lack of problems teaching differing students. It appears that teachers who were

perceived by students to be indirect, stimulating and interactive, and having rapport with students had less problems teaching differing students.

Supervisor ratings for secondary third year teachers were inconsistent with other supervisor ratings. Negative correlations were obtained between the criterion variable and supervisor ratings of "expectations of students" and "variety of teaching techniques." This finding suggests that supervisors of more experienced teachers may not be as accurate as for first year teachers.

Fifth year teacher data provided negative correlations between the Rokeach dogmatism scale scores and lack of problems teaching differing students for both elementary and secondary fifth year teachers. These findings indicate that the more dogmatic the teacher, the more severe the problems with teaching differing students. Also elementary teachers with more school responsibilities reported more problems with the criterion variable while secondary teachers with larger observed class sizes reported more problems with teaching differing students.

Elementary fifth year teachers who received ratings from students of high indirect classroom behavior reported fewer problems with the criterion variable. Secondary teachers had a large number of correlates with student evaluations. All but one of these student evaluations were positively correlated with lack of teacher problems with teaching differing students indicating that teachers who receive favorable ratings from students perceive fewer problems with teaching differing students than do teachers who receive lower student ratings. The one exception was student ratings of "knowledgeable and poised" which was negatively correlated with the criterion.

Inconsistent results were obtained for supervisor ratings for secondary teachers. Both positive and negative correlations were obtained for supervisor

ratings. It appeared that supervisors ratings of "providing for individual differences," and "not formal and aloof" behavior were positively correlated with lack of problems in teaching differing students. "Discipline without being harsh" and "Friendly and Cheerful" were negatively correlated with the criterion variable.

Discussion of the Discipline Factor

In reference to the discipline factor of teacher perceived problems demographic data, self-report inventory data, and classroom observations failed to produce any significant relationship indicators in the student teacher sample. In addition, student evaluation of teacher data failed to produce significant coefficients with the secondary student teacher sample, but did pick up significance with the elementary population on items focusing on rapport and interactive competence. These data indicate that student teachers who were perceived by students as possessing good rapport and interactive competence perceived discipline as less of a problem than their counterparts. Supervisor ratings of student teachers proved to be a major data source which produced many significant coefficients, especially with the secondary student teacher sample. The data in general clearly indicate that student teachers who are rated positively by supervisors on teaching behaviors and attitudes tend not to view discipline as a severe problem.

Coefficient patterns for the first year of teaching were quite similar to those of student teaching in regard to the supervisor ratings as can be seen in Table 7. Patterns were quite different however for the first year secondary teacher population when compared to the student teaching year. In regard to demographic data, a significant coefficient was produced indicating that the number of different classes taught was related to the perceived severity of

discipline as a problem. In addition, classroom observations indicated that those first year teachers with good organization and management skills, rapport, empathy, stimulating style, etc. did not perceive the problem of discipline in the magnitude of their counterparts. Furthermore, peer ratings of first year secondary teachers produced significant coefficients which indicated that those teachers who were perceived as having positive relations with students and who had realistic expectations of their students perceived the discipline factor as less of a problem. Peer ratings of the first year elementary teachers failed to produce significant coefficients.

Third year teacher data yielded quite different patterns of correlates with the discipline factor. Demographic data failed to produce any significant findings with the elementary population, but did produce some interesting results with the secondary teachers. Age of participant indicated that the older the teacher in this group, the less perceived problems with discipline. Unexpected results in this variable set were in relation to grade point average (GPA). These data indicated that the higher the total GPA as well as the GPA in professional education courses, the greater the perceived problems with discipline. Teacher concerns level data consistently indicated that the higher level the concern in regard to self and tasks, the greater the perceived problem with discipline. This would be expected as these individuals have not moved through the concerns hierarchy to the point of impact concerns. Student evaluation of teacher data indicated that teachers rated low on variables of poise, rapport, interactive competence, and who displayed unreasonable negativity perceived discipline as a major problem. Supervisor and peer ratings continued with the same trend of correlates indicating that those rated as demonstrative, stimulating interactive style, fairness, positive student relations and democratic classroom structure had fewer perceived discipline problems.

In the fifth year teacher sample, GPA continued its same trend with correlates indicating that secondary teachers who demonstrated higher GPA's perceiving discipline problems with greater magnitude. This does not hold true for the elementary population. One possible interpretation might be that the secondary group might be characterized as having interest in their respective academic subjects and might view students who do not display this interest in return as discipline problems. However, this is speculation at this point and beyond the data analyzed. The classroom observation variable set on secondary teachers produced expected correlates consistent with the effective teaching literature, however the variable set on student evaluation of teachers indicated some rather surprising results.

As expected, teachers who were rated high in friendliness, cheerfulness, interesting style, possessing good rapport, and using indirect teaching strategies rated discipline problems rather unsignificant. The unexpected or surprising correlate though indicated that those teachers rated as friendly and cheerful toward students by their supervisors perceived discipline as a major problem. This data would indicate that student and supervisor ratings of teachers on this variable are quite inconsistent. As can be viewed in Table 7, the variable sets as related to the discipline factor demonstrate quite differing patterns across level (elementary or secondary) as well as across time (teaching experience). Thus, these data would tend to support, at least in the area of discipline problem concerns, the notion that teachers have similar and different correlates depending upon their level of experience and grade level taught.

Summary of Findings

The following summary statements are presented to provide a concluding overview of the preceeding analyses. They represent, in the authors view, the more interesting and noteworthy of the findings.

1. One of the most consistent of the correlates with the problem factors for secondary teachers was total, subject matter, and professional education grade point averages (GPA's). These findings were disturbing in that the direction of the relationship was negative indicating that the higher the GPA in undergraduate coursework, the more severe the problems participants reported as they entered and remained in teaching. The only factor not having GPA correlates was the Human Relations factor.
2. Self report data regarding perception of professional education and subject matter courses were not as consistent as GPA, but did occur with some frequency. In these cases, with one exception, the correlation coefficients were positive, indicating that participants who perceived their undergraduate teacher preparation program as positive reported problems as less severe.
3. Consistent correlates of teacher perceived problems were teacher concerns about self and teaching tasks. These correlations suggested that teachers with higher concern levels also reported more severe problems in teaching, a logical and expected finding.
4. The Classroom Observation Record data appeared to be useful in predicting elementary student teacher reported problems in "Human Relations" and "Teaching Tasks." The COR variables were also related to secondary teacher reported problems in "Human Relations" and "Discipline." These correlations were positively related to the problems factors indicating the more positive the observed classroom

behavior, the fewer the reported problems. However, the lack of correlations across experience groups raises questions as to the utility of this technique for predicting teacher problems in general.

5. Interaction analysis variables were somewhat more consistent, especially the "percent of lecture" measures. Subjects who lectured greater percentage of the time generally reported more severe problems. Other IA variable correlates indicated that teachers who demonstrated more indirect, student oriented teacher behavior reported less severe problems with teaching.
6. Student evaluations of teachers were consistent correlates with teacher perceived problems. With only four exceptions in 48 observed correlations, SET variables were positively correlated with the problem factors, suggesting that teachers who are perceived as effective by students, report less severe problems with teaching.
7. Supervisor ratings were quite consistent correlates of teacher problem factors, particularly for secondary teachers. This variable set generally correlated positively with teacher reported problems. Teachers who reported problems as less severe, were rated by supervisors as having less severe problems. These data support the contention that supervisors are aware of teacher problems, a point of contention among some educators.
8. Peer ratings of teachers failed to produce consistent correlates with teacher perceived problem factors.

APPENDIX A

CAREER BASE LINE DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Form A

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Name_____

2. Age_____

3. Sex_____

4. Ethnic Group_____

5. Number of brothers and/or sisters_____

6. Size of high school from which you graduated (check one)

   Less than 500_____

   500 - 1000 _____

   Over 1000 _____

7. Present address_____

   Phone_____

8. Permanent Address_____

   Phone_____

9. Address of someone who will always know your address_____

   _____

   Phone_____

10. Teacher education major: Elem._____

    Secondary_____

11. Major(s) or emphasis area(s)_____

12. Minor(s)_____

13. Marital Status_____

14. Number of children_____

15. Spouse's occupation_____

16. Father's occupation_____

17. Mother's occupation_____

18. Number of graduate hours taken?_____

19. What institution?_____

20. Future plans (marriage, graduate school, and other)_____

_____

21. When did you decide to enter the teaching profession?

prior to entering college _____ during the first year _____

2nd year _____ 3rd year _____ 4th year _____ grad. school _____

22. In what type of community were you reared?

rural _____ small town _____ suburban _____ metropolitan _____

23. In what type of community do you prefer to live and teach?

rural _____ small town _____ suburban _____

B. Activity Participation (please check)

1-2 Athletics (varsity)

3-4 Athletics (intramural)

5-6 Music

7-8 Speech and/or drama

Societies and organizations at WKU (please check)

9. Social _____ 10. Professional _____ 11. Service _____

12. Other (list)_____

C. Present Health:

Excellent_____

Good _____

Average _____

Fair _____

Poor _____

TEACHER PREPARATION EVALUATION INVENTORY

FORM A

The Office of Educational Research is interested in obtaining information concerning the preparation of Western graduates in teacher education. This questionnaire is designed to obtain your perception of Western's teacher preparation program and solicit your ideas as to how we may improve the preparation of teachers.

This information will be used to help faculty and administrators in making revisions and further development of courses. Summary data only will be made public and your responses will be kept confidential. The questionnaire will require approximately 20 minutes of your time.

Thank you for your support of this project.

NAME: _____ LEVEL: SECONDARY ELEMENTARY
(Circle One)

1. Generally, how would you rate the required professional education courses as preparing you for the teaching profession?

( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor

2. How would you rate the subject matter preparation you received in terms of preparing you for the teaching profession?

( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor

3. How would you rate your teacher education program in helping you to recognize and solve problems encountered in the classroom?

( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor

The next five items are methods by which you were taught in your professional education courses. Rate each one as to its effectiveness in preparing you for teaching.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
4. Texts and required reading	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Research papers and independent study	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Lectures	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Seminars	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Classroom observation	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Rate items 9-25 on each of the three dimensions shown. 1) How serious a problem is it for you in your teaching situation? 2) How would you evaluate the quality of your college preparation in this area? 3) How sufficient was the quality of your college preparation in this area?

	Seriousness of Problem				Quality of Instruction				Sufficiency of Instruction				
	Severe	Substantial	Little	None at all	Excellent	Good	Poor	Dismal	Far Too Much	Excessive	Substantial	Too Little	None
9. Developing rapport with students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Teaching physically handicapped students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Teaching disrespectful students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Teaching students of different socio-economic levels	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Maintaining discipline	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. Relevance of material from student's point of view	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. Teaching students of different ability levels in the same classroom	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. Relationships with students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Faculty relationships	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. Relationship with administrators	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. Relationship with parents	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Seriousness of Problem				Quality of Instruction				Sufficiency of Instruction				
	Severe	Substantial	Little	None at all	Excellent	Good	Poor	Dismal	Far Too Much	Excessive	Substantial	Too Little	None
20. Test preparation and use for evaluation of student performance	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. Use of alternative teaching techniques	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. Motivating students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. Use of classroom materials including audio visual aids	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. Self-evaluation of teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Knowledge of outside resources to enhance the teaching learning process	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Rate the following college courses on each of the three dimensions shown. 1) How useful or relevant has the course been to your teaching? 2) What was the quality of instruction in the course? 3) How sufficient was the quality of instruction in the course? If you did not take the course, check the appropriate box and go on to the next course. If you took the course, but not at WKU, circle the course and complete the rating.

	Usefulness of Course					Quality of Instruction				Sufficiency of Instruction				
	Not Taken	Of Great Value	Useful	Of Little Value	Useless	Excellent	Good	Poor	Dismal	Far Too Much	Excessive	Sufficient	Too Little	None
ELEMENTARY:														
26. Introduction to Elementary Education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. Human Growth and Development	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. Materials and Methods in Social Studies	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. Teaching of Reading	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. Teaching of Math in Elementary Schools	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Teaching of Science in Elementary Schools	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Test and Measurements in Education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Usefulness of Course					Quality of Instruction				Sufficiency of Instruction				
	Not Taken	Of Great Value	Useful	Of Little Value	Useless	Excellent	Good	Poor	Dismal	Far Too Much	Excessive	Sufficient	Too Little	None
33. Pre-Student Teaching Seminar	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. Audio-Visual Aids	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. Student Teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
SECONDARY														
36. Introduction to Secondary Education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. Human Growth and Development	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. Tests and Measurements	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. Methods and Materials	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
40. Audio-Visual Aids	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
41. Student Teaching	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(( )	( )

42. Are you a member of a professional organization such as the NEA?

( ) YES ( ) NO

43. If yes, rate participation in this organization as to its benefit in your teaching position.

( ) Very Good ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor ( ) Very Poor

Rate the following functions or services as you knew them while you were attending Western Kentucky University.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
44. Counselor Services	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
45. Admissions	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
46. Placement	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
47. Financial Aid	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
48. Academic Advisement	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
49. Records and Registration	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
50. Student Activities	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
51. Availability of Faculty	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Please comment briefly on each of the following questions.

52. To what degree did your courses at WKU shape your ideas about teaching?

53. Is teaching different from what your teacher education courses led you to expect?

54. Did your professional education courses motivate you to use creative ideas in your teaching?

55. How can Western Kentucky University improve its preparation of teachers? List ideas and explain. Use additional space on back of page if necessary.

56. If you have any other comments concerning your preparation at Western Kentucky University or any comments that would be of benefit in our evaluation of the program, please list. Use additional space on back of page if necessary.

APPENDIX B

Variable List and Source

Data Category	Variable	Instrument
Demographic	Age of Participant	TPEI
	Number of Siblings	TPEI
	GPA Total	GPA
	GPA Subject Major	GPA
	GPA Professional Education	GPA
	Number of Classes Taught	TPEI
	Number of Students in Class Observed	TPEI
	Perception of Health	TPEI
	Number of School Responsibilities	TPEI
Self Report	Self Concern (Adult)	TCC
	Self Concern (Pupil)	TCC
	Task Concern (Instruction)	TCC
	Task Concern (Discipline)	TCC
	Impact Concern (Academic)	TCC
	Impact Concern (Environment)	TCC
	Dogmatism Scale	Rokeach
	F-Scale	F-Scale
	Perception of Professional Ed. Courses	TPEI
	Perception of Subject Matter Prep.	TPEI
	Perception of Teacher Ed. Program	TPEI
Classroom Observation	Factor A Organization/Management	COR
	Factor B Empathy/Rapport	COR
	Factor C Pupil Behavior	COR
	Factor D Surgent/Stimulating Style	COR
	Little i/d Ratio	IA
	Big I/D Ratio	IA
	Student Talk to Teacher Talk Ratio	IA
	Percent Silence	IA
	Percent Lecture	IA
	Percent Indirect Teacher Behavior	IA
	Percent Direct Teacher Behavior	IA
	Percent Teacher Talk	IA
	Student Question to Student Resp. Ratio	IA
	Percent Student Talk	IA

Variable List and Source (Continued)

Data Category	Variable	Instrument
Student Evaluation	Friendly and Cheerful	SET 1
	Knowledgeable and Poised	SET 1
	Lively and Interesting	SET 1
	Discipline	SET 1
	Indirect Classroom Procedure	SET 1
	Mean (1-5)	SET $\bar{X}$
	Stimulating/Interactive Style	SET 2
	Rapport	SET 2
	Interactive Competence	SET 2
	Unreasonable Negativity	SET 2
	Fostering Student Self-Esteem	SET 2
Supervisor Ratings And Peer Ratings	Subject Matter Competence	TEP/S 1
	Relations With Students	TEP/S 1
	Expectations of Students	TEP/S 1
	Classroom Teaching Competence	TEP/S 1
	Grasp of Subject	TEP/S 2
	Meaningful and Relevant Examples	TEP/S 2
	Keeps Abreast of New Information	TEP/S 2
	Enthusiasm for Subject	TEP/S 2
	Variety of Teaching Tech.	TEP/S 2
	Stimulating/Interactive Style	TEP/S 2
	Provides for Indiv. Diff.	TEP/S 2
	Confident/Poised/Organized	TEP/S 2
	Warm/Supportive Classroom Climate	TEP/S 2
	Clear Obj./Procedures/Rules	TEP/S 2
	Democratic Classroom	TEP/S 2
	Not Formal and Aloof	TEP/S 2
	Discipline Without Being Harsh	TEP/S 2
	Friendly and Cheerful Toward Students	TEP/S 2
	Concerned With Feelings of Students	TEP/S 2
	Values the Affective Climate	TEP/S 2
	Fair Toward Student	TEP/S 2

Instrument (Source) Description

Source	Description
TPEI	The Teacher Preparation Evaluation Inventory was developed by staff of the Office of Educational Research, assisted by evaluation staff of CEMREL, Inc. in St. Louis, Missouri. It consists of 54 items pertaining to perception of preparation program, coursework, and problems encountered in teaching. Form A also contains ratings of specific courses taken as an undergraduate. Form B omits these course ratings for inservice teachers.
CBLD	Information from the Career Base Line Data Questionnaire has been included with TPEI data for this report. Prepared by Western Kentucky University Educational Research Department, this instrument contains 23 items requesting demographic and professional information from student teachers (Form A) and 17 items requesting similar information from teachers in the field (Form B).
TCC	The Teacher Concerns Checklist was developed by Frances Fuller at the University of Texas at Austin as an assessment of teachers' level of concerns. The TCC is a 56-item Likert scaled instrument scored from one to five. Seven scale scores have been derived from factor analysis using 29 representative items. These items represent three stages of concern: concern with self, concern with teaching role, and concern with pupil benefit.
Rokeach	The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale is a 40-item instrument that measures dogmatic tendencies. It is concerned with the way an individual adheres to a belief rather than with the content of that belief.
F-Scale	The F-scale, Forms 45 and 40, was developed by Adorno, et. al., to measure individual prejudices and antidemocratic tendencies. The 30-item scale was originated to determine personality traits in those holding fascist views but has proven to be useful in other contexts.
COR	The Classroom Observation Record was developed originally in the Teacher's Characteristics Study by Ryan in 1960 as a direct measure of four dimensions of student behavior and 18 dimensions of teacher behavior. A polarized 7-point scale interval is used to rate each behavior. Each dimension is carefully described and defined in a glossary accompanying the recording form. Four factor scores have been derived from the 22 dimensions observed and rated.

Instrument (Source) Description (Continued)

IA

The Interaction Analysis System is a 19 category system based on a modification of the Flanders model and Hough's model. Twelve categories of teacher talk, three categories of student talk, and four non-verbal categories are utilized by observers to record classroom behavior. Ten of the IA variables were used in this report.

SET

Student Evaluation of Teaching I is a ten item instrument used to measure student's perception of classroom behavior. Developed by Veldman and Peck, it was originally derived from the Pupil Observation Survey Report (POSR) which was an outgrowth of research by McClain and Bown (1961).

SET II is a 23-item instrument which measures pupil's assessment of their teachers and the pupil's estimation of the teacher's attitude toward them. The instrument was developed by Haak, Kleiber, and Peck.

TEP/S

The Teacher Evaluation by Peer/Supervisor I was designed at Kansas State Teachers' College to obtain ratings by peers and supervisors on teacher behavior. Four broad items are rated on a five-point scale.

TEP/S II consists of 17-items designed to measure three areas of perceived teacher behavior: subject matter competence, teaching competence, and relationship with students. The 7-point, agree to disagree, scale was developed by Dr. Ron Adams at Western Kentucky University.

References

Adams, Ronald D. Critical Findings from the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program: Teacher Entry, Retention, and Change. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, 1979.

_____. Rationale for Follow-Up Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Paper presented at annual meeting MSERA, 1978.

_____. Western Kentucky University's Follow-Up Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Paper presented at Workshop for Teacher Education Program Follow-Up Studies, Austin, Texas, 1978.

_____. "Western Kentucky University's Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program: A Brief History from September 1971 through November 1977," technical unpublished paper.

_____ and Ayers, Jerry. Presentation and Simulation of an Illustrative Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Presented at annual meeting AACTE, 1978.

_____; Hutchinson, Sharla and Martray, Carl. A Developmental Study of Teacher Concerns Across Time. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, 1980.

_____ and Lewis, Tessella. "Student Teachers 'Those Who Do' and 'Those Who Don't'," Issues in Education. Volume 2, Number 3, November, 1976.

_____ and Linz, Carol L. "Teacher Reactions to Western Kentucky University's Teacher Preparation Program," unpublished research, 1979.

_____ and Sandefur, J. T. Factors Influencing the Perceived Problems of First Year Teachers. Paper presented at MSERA, 1976.

_____ and Shiek, David A. Relationships Among Pupil Outcome Measures and Teacher Characteristics/Behavior for Preschool Disadvantaged Children. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, 1978.

Adorno, T. W. et. al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Cruickshank, Donald R.; Kennedy, John J. and Myers, Betty. Perceived Problems of Secondary School Teachers. ERIC Document Number 106264, 1975.

Davis, Glen; Underwood, David and Adams, Ronald D. A Reexamination of the Factor Structure of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Across Grade Levels. Paper presented at annual meeting MSERA, 1979.

Flanders, Ned A. "Teacher Influence Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 397, 1960.

Gaede, O. F. "Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers," The Clearinghouse, Volume 51, 1978.

George, Archie. Analysis of Five Hypothesized Factors on the Teacher Concerns Checklist, Form B, technical report, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

Haak, Ruth A.; Kleiber, Douglas A. and Peck, Robert F. Student Evaluation of Teacher, II, manual, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1970.

Hough, J. B. "An Observational System for the Analysis of Classroom Instruction," In Interaction Analysis: Theory Research and Application. Edited by E. J. Amidon and J. B. Hough. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Landsmann, L. "Is teaching hazardous to your health?" Today's Education, Volume 67, 1978.

Pankratz, Roger and Harryman, Eugene. The Western Kentucky University Evaluation Model: Implications for Career Decisions. Paper presented at annual meeting AACTE, 1978.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. Basic Books, New York, 1960.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Sandefur, J. T. An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. 1970.

_____. A Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Paper presented at annual meeting AACTE, 1978.

_____ and Adams, Ronald D. "A Case Study of Second-Year Teacher Education Graduates," Journal of Teacher Education. XXIV, 3, Fall, 1973.

_____ and Adams, Ronald D. "An Evaluation of Teaching: An Interim Research Report," Journal of Teacher Education. XXVII, 1, Spring, 1976.

Shiek, David A. and Adams, Ronald D. "Factor Score Interpretation of the Classroom Observational Record," Technical Report No. 78-1, Office of Educational Research, Western Kentucky University, July, 1978.

Veldman, Donald J. "Student Evaluation of Teaching", Research Methodology Monograph No. 10, Austin Research and Development Center, University of Texas, 1970.

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.